

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 13-23 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-11 and 13-22 stand rejected. Claims 1, 2, 16, and 20-22 are amended. Claim 23 is added. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 16 and addition of claim 23 can be found in the originally filed specification at paragraphs [0006], [0016], [0029], and [0030]. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being dependent from cancelled claim 12. Applicants have amended claims 20-22 to render them dependent from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 16, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over by Li et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,397,181) in view of Dweck et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,970,870). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The teachings of Li et al. are generally directed toward a method and apparatus for voice annotation and retrieval of multimedia data. In particular, the Examiner relies on Li et al. to teach a collaborative tag handling system for dispatching said at least one tag to a plurality of individuals for review. However, the section of Li et al. cited by the Examiner (column 4, lines 15-20) merely teaches post annotation in which a speaker or narrator reviews media content during playback and annotates it with speech using a

formal descriptive language. Li et al. do not teach, suggest, or motivate a collaborative tag handling system for dispatching tags to a plurality of individuals for review based on tag source in which tag source is determinable from labels added to tags to identify which of plural speech inputs provided the information for defining the tag.

The teachings of Dweck et al. are generally directed toward facilitating access to documents by associated tags. In particular, the Examiner relies on Dweck et al. to teach that a label of a tag can identify the creator of the document with which the tag is associated, so that inconsistencies between tags of different document creators can be resolved (col. 5, line 63-col. 6, line 3). However, Dweck et al. do not teach, suggest, or motivate a collaborative tag handling system for dispatching tags to a plurality of individuals for review based on tag source in which tag source is determinable from labels added to tags to identify which of plural speech inputs provided the information for defining the tag.

Applicant's claimed invention is generally directed toward a collaborative media indexing system and method. In particular, Applicants' claimed invention is directed toward a collaborative tag handling system for dispatching tags to a plurality of individuals for review based on tag source in which tag source is determinable from labels added to tags to identify which of plural speech inputs provided the information for defining the tag. For example, independent claim 1, especially as amended, recites, "at least two speech inputs, each of which provides information for defining at least one tag, thereby providing speech information from two different speakers and defining two different tags ... wherein each said at least one tag includes a label identifying which of said speech inputs provided the tag, thereby identifying a source." Claim 16, as

amended, recites similar subject matter. Therefore, Li et al. and Dweck et al. do not teach all of the limitations of independent claims 1 and 16, especially as amended.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), along with rejection of all claims dependent therefrom.

Claims 3-6, 11, 14-15, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,397,181) in view of Dweck et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,970, 870) and Bennett et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,884,256). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For discussion of the teachings of Li et al. and Dweck et al., Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to remarks detailed above with respect to rejection of independent claims 1 and 16.

Bennet et al. do not teach all of the elements recited in independent claims 1 and 16, nor does the Examiner rely on Bennet et al. in this capacity. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicant's respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 3-6, 11, 14-15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on their dependence from allowable base claims.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,397,181) in view of Dweck et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,970, 870) and Ebert (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0144985). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For discussion of Li et al. and Dweck et al., Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to remarks detailed above with respect to rejection of independent claim 1.

Ebert does not teach all of the elements recited in independent claim 1, nor does the Examiner rely on Ebert in this capacity. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicant's respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on its dependence from an allowable base claim.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,397,181) in view of Dweck et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,970, 870) and Jain et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,463,444). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For discussion of Li et al. and Dweck et al., Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to remarks detailed above with respect to rejection of independent claim 1.

Jain et al. do not teach all of the elements recited in independent claim 1, nor does the Examiner rely on Jain et al. in this capacity. These differences are significant.

Moreover, Applicants note that claim 10 is dependent from claim 9, and that Jain et al. does not teach generating an attribute using a sensor. Therefore, the rejection of claim 10 is improperly based on Li et al., Dweck et al., and Jain et al. alone, especially where the Examiner relies upon Ebert teach elements of claim 9.

Accordingly, Applicant's respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on its dependence from an allowable base claim.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,397,181) in view of Dweck et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,970, 870) and Srivastava et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,549,922). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For discussion of Li et al. and Dweck et al., Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to remarks detailed above with respect to rejection of independent claim 1.

Srivastava et al. do not teach all of the elements recited in independent claim 1, nor does the Examiner rely on Srivastava et al. in this capacity. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicant's respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on its dependence from an allowable base claim.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,397,181) in view of Dweck et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,970, 870) and Lui et al. (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0105589). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For discussion of Li et al. and Dweck et al., Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to remarks detailed above with respect to rejection of independent claim 16.

Lui et al. do not teach all of the elements recited in independent claim 16, nor does the Examiner rely on Liu et al. in this capacity. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicant's respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on its dependence from an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 17, 2006

By: Gregory Stobbs
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

[GAS/JSB/kp]